

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

CHARLES V. COLEMAN,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAVID R. BRAND, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:23-cv-06135-DGE

ORDER ON MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION (DKT. NO.
32)

On May 3, 2024, Secretary Christine Wormuth moved to dismiss this action. (Dkt. No. 26.) Plaintiff Charles Coleman did not file a response. Accordingly, the Court issued an order to show cause as to why this action should not be dismissed, affording Plaintiff eighteen days to respond. (Dkt. No. 29.) As Plaintiff did not timely respond, the Court dismissed this action. (Dkt. No. 30.)

Plaintiff now files a “motion to rebut motion to dismiss,” which the Court construes as a motion for reconsideration. (Dkt. No. 32.) Motions for reconsideration will ordinarily be denied


absent a showing of manifest error in the Court's decision or new facts or legal authority which could not have been presented to the Court earlier with reasonable diligence. LCR 7(h)(1).

Plaintiff's motion states he has had difficulty securing legal representation and should be afforded lenience given that he is a pro se litigant. (Dkt. No. 32 at 1.) However, while courts construe pleadings liberally in favor of pro se litigants, pro se litigants are required to follow procedural rules. *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 54 (9th Cir. 1995). Accordingly, Plaintiff's pro se status is not a basis on which the Court will reconsider its dismissal of this case. *See id.*

Plaintiff also states that he believes his complaint in this action was a "continuation of the same complaint that he filed with the EEO Commission in December, 2020 seeking relief for Wrongful Termination" (Dkt. No. 32 at 1) and references a decision by an administrative law judge which concluded Plaintiff's employer failed to establish his discharge was for misconduct (*id.* at 2). But Plaintiff does not explain the legal significance of these assertions insofar as they relate to dismissal of his complaint.

Finding no manifest error in the Court's order, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion. (Dkt. No. 32.)

Dated this 9th day of July 2024.



David G. Estudillo
United States District Judge